

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-20 were pending in the application. Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 10 and 15. Claim 7 is amended to add a period at the end of the sentence. No new matter has been added by way of the amendments. Claims 10 and 15 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new claims are added. Thus, Claims 1-9, 11-14, and 16-20 are now pending for reconsideration. In light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, which prompt and favorable action is respectfully requested.

**Summary of the Office Action**

In the Office Action, claim 16 was objected to as being informal. Claims 1 and 3-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,122,541 to Cosomon et al. (“Cosomon”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,314,310 to Ben-Haim et al. (“Ben-Haim”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,907,395 to Schulz et al. (“Schulz”). Claims 2 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cosomon in view of Ben-Haim and Schulz and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,474,180 to Angulo (“Angulo”). Claims 15 and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The rejections and objections are respectfully traversed in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

**Allowable Subject Matter / Objections to Claims 15 and 16**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 15 and 16 contain allowable subject matter. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the elements of former claim 15, including former intervening claim 10. Thus, claim 1 now corresponds to former claim 15 rewritten in independent form as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is now in condition for allowance. Claim 16 is amended to depend from claim 1. Since claim 1 is in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to claim 16.

### **Response to Rejection of Claims 1 and 3-14**

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of claims 1 and 3-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based upon the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

As previously stated, claim 1 is amended to present the subject matter of allowable claim 15 in independent form. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over the cited references for at least the reasons stated in the Examiner's statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter. (Office Action, p. 9). Since claims 3-9 and 11-14 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3-9 and 11-14 are also allowable for depending from an allowable claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1 and 3-9 and 11-14 under 35 USC § 103(a). The rejection of claim 10 is now moot because it is cancelled.

### **Response to Rejection of Claims 2 and 17-20**

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of claims 2 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based upon the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Since claims 2 and 17-20 depend directly or indirectly from amended claim 1, which is allowable claim 15 rewritten in independent form, Applicants submit that these claims are also allowable over the cited references for at least the reasons stated in the Examiner's statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2 and 17-20 under 35 USC § 103(a).

### **Objection to claim 16 for Informality**

Claim 16 was objected to for lacking antecedent basis for the phrase "said wedge shaped members." As discussed above, claim 16 is amended to depend from claim 1. Claim 1, as amended, recites the element "wherein said emitters are operatively associated with wedge shaped members." Therefore, Applicants submit that amended

Appln. No. 10/808,459  
Amdt dated November 2, 2009  
Reply to Office Action of August 4, 2009

Via EFS

claim 16 now has sufficient antecedent basis for all claimed elements. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to claim 16.

## CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-9, 11-14, and 16-20 are now in condition for allowance and requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned regarding any issue related to furtherance of the examination of this application.

Very truly yours,  
THE MARBURY LAW GROUP, PLLC

Dated: November 2, 2009  
By 

Robert Hansen  
Reg. No. 43,656  
Tel.: (703) 391-2900

The Marbury Law Group, PLLC  
11800 Sunrise Valley Dr., Suite 1000  
Reston, VA 20191